

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamerski (U.S. 3,589,025). Claims 23-25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Schloss (U.S. 4,044,772). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamerski (U.S. 3,589,025) in view of Roethel (U.S. 1,722,825). Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamerski (U.S. 3,589,025). Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamerski (U.S. 3,589,025) in view of Streed (U.S. 3,332,620). Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schloss (U.S. 3,938,348). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 has been amended to distinguish at least one power-generating wind turbine circuit element from such devices as blowers, fans, etc., and make said Claim 13 consistent with the other elements of Claims 13-22. Claim 23 has been amended to distinguish controlling an operational parameter of a power-generating wind turbine from such devices as blowers, fans, etc. and make said Claim 23 consistent with other elements of claims 23-28.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hamerski. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13, as amended, is patentable over the cited reference because Hamerski does not disclose all of the features of the claim, and is therefore improperly applied under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

With respect to Claim 13, the Office Action cites Hamerski as disclosing a power generating wind turbine switch cabinet by item 9. Item 9 is described in Hamerski as an "exothermic gas generator" (Col. 3, lines 15-16), as a "gas generator" (Col. 3, line 53) and as a "gas supply unit" (Col. 3, lines 49-50). Nowhere does Hamerski, describe item 9 as "a power generating wind turbine switch cabinet" or anything consistent with "a power generating wind turbine switch cabinet" as recited in independent Claim 13. Further, the power generating wind turbine switch cabinet of the present application is a wind turbine that generates electric power. The "exothermic gas generator" of Hamerski does not generate power but produces an exhaust gas mainly of CO₂, N₂ and H₂O (Col. 4, lines 24-25).

Further, with respect to Claim 13, the Office Action cites "at least one wind turbine circuit element coupled to the power-generating wind turbine switch cabinet" as disclosed by blower 69. Claim 13, as amended, cites "at least one power-

generating wind turbine circuit element coupled to the power-generating wind turbine switch cabinet". Applicant respectfully asserts that a blower is not a power-generating wind turbine circuit element, since the "exothermic gas generator" is not a power-generating wind turbine. Further, blower 69 is also not a "power-generating wind turbine" since as a blower, it does not generate power, but rather uses power to operate. Still further, blower 69 is not a "power-generating wind turbine circuit element.

Still further with respect to Claim 13, the Office Action cites asserts that "a drying arrangement adapted to prevent water deposition onto the at least one power-generating wind turbine circuit element, the drying arrangement including an air flow device generating an air flow in a region of the at least one power-generating wind turbine circuit element to counteract the water deposition onto the at least one power-generating wind turbine circuit element" is disclosed at Col. 4, lines 44-66. Col. 4, lines 44-66 address removal of a moisture from "an exothermic gas generator", however, for the reasons stated above do not disclose "a drying arrangement adapted to prevent water deposition onto *the at least one power-generating wind turbine circuit element*" [emphasis added].

Therefore, for at least the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that Hamerski does not teach, suggest, or disclose the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that since Hamerski does not teach, suggest or disclose the features of the claimed invention, Hamerski cannot be applied under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and as such, the rejection must be withdrawn.

Given that the cited reference fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claim, and for the reasons cited above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn and that claim 13 be allowed.

Further, the Office Action asserts that dependent claims 14-16 are anticipated by Hamerski and dependent Claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamerski in view of Roethel. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being as being unpatentable over Hamerski. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamerski in view of Streed. For the above reasons, previously noted, independent claim 13 is not anticipated by Hamerski. Neither Roethel, nor obvious art, nor Streed remedy these deficiencies.

Given that claims 14-22 depend from independent claim 13, which is patentable over the cited reference for the above-noted reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 14-22 are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 14-22 be

withdrawn. Applicant submits that Claims 13-22 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. For the above reasons, previously noted, independent Claim 13 is not anticipated by Hamerski. Neither Roethel, nor obvious art, nor Streed remedy these deficiencies.

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schloss. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 23 is patentable over the cited reference because Schloss does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim.

Claim 23, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:

controlling an operational parameter of a power-generating wind turbine by at least one power-generating wind turbine circuit element coupled to a power-generating wind turbine switch cabinet; and

generating air flow in the internal space of the power-generating wind turbine switch cabinet using an air flow device to counteract a deposition of condensation water onto the at least one power-generating wind turbine circuit element

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 23 requires a power-generating wind turbine circuit element and a power-generating wind turbine switch cabinet and using an air flow device to generate an air flow to counteract a deposition of condensation water onto at least one power-generating wind turbine circuit element. Schloss fails to disclose at least these limitations of the claim.

Schloss is directed to "An apparatus for cardiovascular conditioning, alternative bodily waste eliminations and other physiological purposes includes a chamber in which a person is subjected to an environmental temperature elevated sufficiently to cause profuse sweating and increased heart rate". Schloss employs an ordinary fan to circulate air through the chamber at various rates for establishing workout conditions within the chamber.

The Office Action would suggest that the limitation of controlling an operational parameter of a power-generating wind turbine is satisfied by operation of the fan (Col 7, line 52 to Col. 8, line 10). The instant section describes airflow created by fans powered by electric motors. The object of the invention of Schloss is to control climate within the workout chamber. A power-generating wind turbine is a clearly distinct device that is powered by or driven by the wind. The fan component of Schloss workout chamber creates an air flow, but are not controlling an operational parameter of a power-generating wind turbine. As such, Schloss fails to disclose controlling an operational parameter of a power-generating wind turbine by at least one power-

generating wind turbine circuit element and a power-generating wind turbine switch cabinet for a wind turbine, as required by claim 23.

The Office Action would suggest that “generating air flow in the internal space of the switch cabinet using an air flow generating device to counteract a deposition of condensation water onto the at least one circuit element” is disclosed at Col. 10, lines 1-60. However, while Schloss does describe the generation of an airflow, nowhere in the cited passage or elsewhere does Schloss disclose generating an airflow to counteract a deposition of condensation water onto the at least one power-generating wind turbine circuit element. Further, Schloss does not identify any power-generating wind turbine circuits within the power-generating wind turbine switch box for which an airflow is generated to counteract deposition of condensation water. Instead with Schloss, the airflow is generated primarily for controlling ambient for physical exertion within the workout chamber and not for “counteracting a deposition of condensation water onto the at least one power-generating wind turbine circuit element”. Therefore, for at least the above rationale, Applicant respectfully submits that Schloss does not teach, suggest, or disclose the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that since Schloss does not teach, suggest or disclose the features of the claimed invention, Schloss cannot be applied under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and, as such, the rejection must be withdrawn.

Given that the cited reference fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claim, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 is patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102b be withdrawn.

Further, the Office Action asserts that dependent Claims 23-25 and 28 are anticipated by Schloss under 35 USC §102(b) and that dependent Claims 26 and 27 are unpatentable over Schloss under 35 USC §103(a). However, the deficiencies of Schloss with respect to under underlying independent claim 23, as previously described, are not remedied.


Given that claims 24-28 depend from independent claim 23, which is patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 23-28 are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 24-25 and 28 under 35 USC §102(b) and claims 26-27 under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn. Applicant submits that claims 23-28 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submit that the application is in order for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

It is believed that no fees or charges are applicable to the filing of this paper. However, if necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 070849 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in even better condition for allowance, please contact the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Edward J. Smith
Reg. No. 56,651

General Electric Company
GE Energy
One River Road
43-219
Schenectady, New York 12345
November 24, 2008
Telephone: (518) 385-2822